

Absence of the Mott transition in infinite dimensions

Kurt Fischer

Department of Applied Physics, University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan
(March 16, 1999)

It is shown that the half filled Hubbard model does not display the Mott metal-insulator transition, in the limit of infinite dimensions. The proposed transition on the Bethe lattice is proved to be an artifact. In the atomic limit, the model is always in the antiferromagnetic phase, which can be described by the Weiss mean field model.

PACS numbers: 71.10.Fd, 71.30.+h, 71.28.+d

The competition between the kinetic energy and the Coulomb repulsion of electrons in a metal can cause a metal-insulator transition [1]. The basic model which should describe such a transition, is the one-band Hubbard model at half filling,

$$H = \frac{t}{\sqrt{z}} \sum_{\substack{(ij) \\ \sigma=\uparrow,\downarrow}} c_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{j\sigma} + U \sum_i (c_{i\uparrow}^{\dagger} c_{i\uparrow} - \frac{1}{2})(c_{i\downarrow}^{\dagger} c_{i\downarrow} - \frac{1}{2}) \quad (1)$$

where the hopping $\propto t$ is between (not necessarily only nearest) neighbors (ij) on a lattice of coordination number z , and the constant chemical potential has been incorporated in the Hamiltonian. A theoretical understanding of the nature of the Mott transition is still lacking. The reason is that it will occur when the gain of kinetic energy due to hopping $\propto t$ equals the loss of Coulomb energy $\propto U$, where an expansion in either t or U is not permitted. However, it was observed that the Hubbard model simplifies but remains nontrivial in the limit of infinite coordination number z or dimensions $\propto z$ [2], so that, $1/z$ being small already for three-dimensional lattices, it could serve as a starting point for an expansion in $1/z$. As further evidence it was cited that the two extreme cases $t = 0$ and $U = 0$, are captured exactly in the limit of infinite z [3].

In particular, it is taken for granted that the infinite dimensional Hubbard model shows a Mott transition at zero temperature and a finite critical value of U , that is, a transition between a paramagnetic metal and a paramagnetic insulator, after frustrating the tendency to antiferromagnetic ordering. However, there is a controversy about the precise form of this transition [4–9]. Specifically, there is the question whether the Fermi liquid quasi-particle spectral weight vanishes at the same value of U as the Mott gap of the one-particle excitation spectrum opens. In addition the results for the quasi-particle spectral weight differ significantly already away from the proposed transition.

It is the intention of this article, to show that the discrepancy in the results of the various approaches predicting the Mott transition in infinite dimensions, can be explained by the fact that they are ill-defined, and that this transition is absent. The proof consists of four steps:

First it is recalled that there is no Mott gap, if the limit of infinite dimensions is taken on a Bravais lattice [10], because its one-particle density of states has an infinite width.

Therefore, secondly, a proof for the existence of the Mott transition has been suggested for the Bethe lattice at infinite z , because its one-particle density of states would be semicircular and hence would have a finite width [10,11]. In addition, it has been argued that the same semicircular density of states is realized for a lattice where the hopping matrix elements are distance *independent*, Gaussian distributed random variables [5,12], to fully frustrate antiferromagnetic ordering. However, it will be shown that the Bethe and the fully frustrated lattice, have no well defined thermodynamical limit, and hence no well defined one-particle density of states.

Thirdly, it was argued that such a semicircular density of states, or more generally a density of states of finite width, can be assumed *ad hoc*, together with a momentum independent one-particle self-energy, to simulate the limit of infinite dimensions [4,11] without referring to a particular lattice, but retaining a finite bandwidth as in finite dimensions. However, it will be proved here that no Hamiltonian with such properties exists, describing a limit of infinite z .

Finally, it will be shown that even the qualitative features of the obtained one-particle excitation spectrum are incorrect, because the limit of infinite dimensions, in the paramagnetic phase, does *not* reproduce correctly the atomic limit $t \rightarrow 0$. Even in the limit of infinite dimensions, the correct atomic limit of the Hubbard model (1) is the Heisenberg antiferromagnet. In particular this will invalidate the widely used second-order perturbation theory [13].

For the first point, consider an infinite dimensional Bravais lattice, whose one-particle density of states ρ_0 never vanishes [14]. Because the self-energy is momentum independent for infinite dimensions, the local one-particle Green function $G(i\omega_n) = \int \rho_0(\epsilon) G(i\omega_n, \epsilon) d\epsilon$ fulfills

$$G(\omega - i0^+) = \int \frac{\rho_0(\epsilon)}{\omega - \epsilon - \Sigma(\omega) - i0^+} d\epsilon. \quad (2)$$

If the one-particle excitation spectrum $\rho(\omega) = \Im G(\omega - i0^+)/\pi$ of the local one-particle Green function G would have a Mott gap, G would be real valued, if ω lies in the gap. For such values of ω , except for possible isolated zeroes of G , the self-energy Σ must be real as well so that

$$\rho(\omega) = \rho_0(\omega - \Re \Sigma(\omega)) = 0,$$

which is a contradiction. Hence a Mott transition is absent on Bravais lattices in infinite dimensions.

For the second point, in order to have a Mott transition and to preserve the finite bandwidth of finite dimensional lattices, usually the Bethe lattice is used, or a fully frustrated lattice where the hopping matrix elements are distance *independent*, Gaussian distributed random variables [4,5]. These lattices have, however, no translational invariance:

To begin with the Bethe lattice, the reason is, that this lattice cannot be obtained as the thermodynamical limit of its finite counterpart, the Cayley tree of coordination number z and linear dimension N , because its surface to volume ratio is for large N and z , proportional to $1 - 1/z$ [15], hence remaining finite in the limit of large N , while for a usual Bravais lattice this vanishes as z/N . For the Ising model, for example, this leads to a spurious phase transition of the Bethe-Peierls type [15].

Now, all derivations of the limit of infinite z require at some stage [4,5] that there is a skeleton expansion of the self-energy $\Sigma_{ij}(\omega)$ which becomes local $\propto \delta_{ij}$, and hence momentum independent. For this last step translational invariance of the lattice is required. While for a Bravais lattice of coordination number z this holds independently of the boundary conditions, asymptotically in the sense,

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{ij}(\omega) - \delta_{ij}\Sigma_{ii}(\omega) &= O(1/z) \\ \Sigma_{ii}(\omega) - \Sigma_{jj}(\omega) &= O(z/N), i \neq j \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

allowing for the thermodynamical limit, the right hand side of the last equation, is of the order one for a Cayley tree. Hence the arguments [4,16] leading to a momentum independent self-energy and the semicircular density of states of a Bethe lattice, are invalid, because it is *not* allowed to take the thermodynamical limit from the outset [17]. The same arguments can be applied to the fully frustrated lattice, because there by construction, every lattice point is at the surface.

In order to show the third point, the self-energy is supposed to be momentum independent, *and* a density of states of finite width D is assumed *ad hoc* to be realized by a Hamiltonian system, in infinite dimensions. The half-filled, paramagnetic case is considered. Then the Luttinger-Ward functional Ω describing the free energy of the system per lattice site,

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega &= -T \sum_{n,\sigma} \int \rho_0(\epsilon) [\ln G^{-1}(i\omega_n, \epsilon) + (i\omega_n - \epsilon)G(i\omega_n, \epsilon) \\ &\quad - \sum_{\nu} \frac{1}{2\nu} \Sigma^{(\nu)}(i\omega_n)G(i\omega_n, \epsilon) - 1] d\epsilon \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

of the one-particle Green function G , is known [18] to have the saddle point property $\frac{\delta}{\delta G}\Omega = 0$ if the Dyson equation holds. Here, $\Sigma^{(\nu)}$ denotes the ν th order self-energy, in terms of skeleton diagrams. At low temperatures, the first order correction to the ground state energy is therefore given by replacing G by its $T = 0$ value. All but one of the 2ν Matsubara sums in the ν th order self-energy $\Sigma^{(\nu)}$ can be replaced by its $T = 0$ integral limits [19]. This can be performed in 2ν ways, so that the last three terms in Eq. (4) become $(i\omega_n - \epsilon - \Sigma(i\omega_n))G(i\omega_n, \epsilon) - 1$, to cancel each other. The remaining term, converted into a real integral, gives the first order correction to the ground state energy as $\hat{\Omega}(T) - \hat{\Omega}(0)$, with

$$\hat{\Omega} = -\frac{2}{\pi} \int \int d\omega d\epsilon f(\omega) \rho_0(\epsilon) \arg G_{T=0}^{-1}(\omega - i0^+, \epsilon) \quad (5)$$

where $\arg$ is defined such that $\arg(1) = 0$, and f is the Fermi function [19].

In the sequel, the insulating phase is assumed to exist for sufficiently large U at zero temperature, which has been shown [11] to solve Eq. (2) for the finite width, semicircular ρ_0 . Then the one-particle excitation spectrum $\rho(\omega)$ has a gap Δ , around zero frequency, and the local Green function

$$G(\omega - i0^+) = \int \frac{\rho(\epsilon)}{\omega - i0^+ - \epsilon} d\epsilon \quad (6)$$

is real valued for $|\omega| < \Delta$ and has a Taylor expansion around zero as $G(\omega) = -\alpha\omega/\Delta^2 + \dots$ with positive $\alpha = \Delta^2 \int \rho(\epsilon)/\epsilon^2 d\epsilon$ of the order one. Because ρ_0 has a finite width D , this and Eq. (2) imply for the self-energy for small ω and $|\Sigma(\omega) - \omega| > D$ the asymptotic behavior,

$$\Sigma(\omega) = \Delta^2/(\alpha\omega) + \dots \quad (7)$$

Using the Dyson equation

$$G^{-1}(\omega - i0^+, \epsilon) = \omega - i0^+ - \epsilon - \Sigma(\omega - i0^+), \quad (8)$$

then for small temperatures $T \ll \Delta^2/D, \Delta$ and frequencies $\omega \lesssim T$ relevant for the first order low temperature correction to the free energy, $\arg G^{-1}$ is given by

$$\arg\left(-\frac{\Delta^2}{\alpha\omega - i0^+}\right) = -\pi\Theta(\omega). \quad (9)$$

Hence a *negative* entropy

$$\Omega(T) - \Omega(0) = 2T \ln 2 + \dots \quad (10)$$

results, which is a contradiction. The physical reason is of course, that there is no density of states of finite width, for the infinite dimensional limit of a Bravais lattice: In particular, the Mott transition on the “Bethe lattice” is an artifact. Any attempt to solve the infinite dimensional Hubbard model on the “Bethe lattice” will produce spurious results, because the “Dyson equation” does not correspond to a real Hamiltonian system, in infinite dimensions.

As to the fourth point, it could be asked, if not at least the qualitative features of the one-particle excitation spectrum in the paramagnetic phase are reliable, because in the limit of infinite z , the atomic limit $t \rightarrow 0$ is reproduced exactly? In particular it is believed [4] that two Hubbard bands around the energies $\pm U/2$ are emerging, as U is increased. The numerical procedures as well as second order perturbation theory [4] suggest this. In addition, second order perturbation theory reproduces, at half filling, the atomic limit of the local Green function exactly [4],

$$G(i\omega_n)^{-1} = i\omega_n - (U/2)^2/i\omega_n = i\omega_n - \Sigma^{(2)}(i\omega_n) \quad (11)$$

so it seems that it can be used as an interpolation scheme between the two extremes $t = 0$ and $U = 0$, and as a starting point for an expansion around the atomic limit.

However, this argument contains a flaw: Eq. (11) shows only that *because* the bare second order self-energy is exact, there is no well defined functional of the full Green functions, in terms of skeleton self-energies: The limit of infinite z , in the paramagnetic phase, does *not* reproduce correctly the atomic limit $t \rightarrow 0$. The reason is that the ground state for $t = 0$ is highly spin degenerate, so that there is no diagram technique [20], to justify a momentum independent self-energy. *Even* in infinite dimensions, this degeneracy must be lifted first, to arrive at the Heisenberg antiferromagnet [21]. In fact, if the Luttinger-Ward functional is expanded to second order in the skeleton self-energy [22], neither a Mott transition nor a precursor of Hubbard bands were observed for intermediate U , in the paramagnetic phase. This completes the proof that there is no Mott transition in infinite dimensions.

Finally, it is focused on the infinite dimensional Heisenberg antiferromagnet as the effective Hamiltonian in the limit of small t/U , of the half-filled Hubbard model in infinite dimensions, with exchange coupling $J \propto t^2/(Uz)$. Its ground state on a hypercubic lattice is the Néel state [23], suggesting that the infinite dimensional limit of the Heisenberg antiferromagnet is the Ising model, but this has not been shown explicitly so far. For a proof, the Dyson-Maleev representation [24] $S_i^+ = b_i^+(1 - b_i^+b_i^-)$, $S_i^- = b_i^-$ and $S_i^z = b_i^+b_i^- - 1/2$ for the respective *ferromagnetic* Heisenberg model (coupling $-J$) in terms of bosons is used, acting on its ground state as vacuum. The unphysical states are projected out by an additional, large on-site interaction $\propto \sum_i b_i^+b_i^+b_i^-b_i^-$. Now the same arguments as for the fermionic system [22] can be applied. In contrast to the fermionic model, the one-particle (spin wave) terms scale as $1/z$, so that the spin-wave density of states collapses to a δ function, leaving only the ferromagnetic Ising model in the limit of infinite z , which transforms to the antiferromagnetic Ising model if the sign of J is reversed. The Ising model itself reduces in infinite dimensions to the Weiss mean field theory. Corrections to order $1/z$ for the Heisenberg model can be calculated by mapping it onto an effective spin-boson model [25].

To conclude, what physical picture emerges from the preceding discussion? Clearly a Mott transition in the paramagnetic phase, as envisaged on the basis of a limit of infinite dimensions, is absent. The physical reasons are twofold: Firstly, although a generic *finite dimensional* Bravais lattice has of course a finite bandwidth, its proper infinite dimensional counterpart has not, thus prohibiting a Mott transition. This defect of the theory *cannot* be corrected by enforcing a finite bandwidth in infinite dimensions, because the resulting “Dyson” equation does not describe a meaningful Hamiltonian.

Secondly, there is no well defined limit of infinite dimensions for the Hubbard model in the atomic limit in the paramagnetic phase. The reason is, that the ground state for a vanishing kinetic energy is highly degenerate, so that for an expansion around the atomic limit, this intrinsic spin degeneracy has to be lifted: A paramagnetic insulating phase does not exist. In infinite dimensions, a simple Weiss mean field picture emerges.

Further work on the subject will concentrate on these long range ordering processes, which in view of the arguments presented above, seem to dominate the Mott phenomenon in infinite dimensions.

The author is indebted to Prof. N. Nagaosa, Dr. S. Murakami, and Dr. Chang-Ming Ho, for numerous discussions on the subject. The financial support by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science is kindly acknowledged.

-
- [1] N. Mott, *Metal-insulator transitions* (Taylor & Francis, London, 1990).
 - [2] W. Metzner and D. Vollhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 324 (1989).
 - [3] A. Georges and G. Kotliar, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 6479 (1992).
 - [4] A. Georges, G. Kotliar, W. Krauth, and M. Rozenberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. **68**, 13 (1996).
 - [5] R. Noack and F. Gebhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1915 (1999).
 - [6] R. Bulla, cond-mat/9902290 (unpublished).
 - [7] D. Logan and P. Nozieres, Phil. Trans. R. Soc. London **A 356**, 249 (1998).
 - [8] S. Kehrein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 3912 (1998).
 - [9] J. Schlipf *et al.*, cond-mat/9902267 (unpublished).
 - [10] A. Georges and W. Krauth, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 1240 (1992).
 - [11] M. Rozenberg, X. Zhang, and G. Kotliar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 1236 (1992).
 - [12] A. Georges and W. Krauth, Rev. Phys. B **48**, 7167 (1993).
 - [13] X. Zhang, M. Rozenberg, and G. Kotliar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1666 (1993).
 - [14] E. Müller-Hartmann, Z. Phys. B **74**, 507 (1989).
 - [15] T. Eggarter, Phys. Rev. B **9**, 2989 (1974).
 - [16] E. Economou, *Green's Functions in Quantum Physics* (Springer, Berlin, 1979).
 - [17] N. Ashcroft and N. Mermin, *Solid State Physics* (Saunders College, Fort Worth, 1976).
 - [18] J. M. Luttinger and J. C. Ward, Phys. Rev. **118**, 1417 (1960).
 - [19] J. M. Luttinger, Phys. Rev. **119**, 1153 (1960).
 - [20] A. Abrikosov, L. Gorkov, and I. Dzyaloshinski, *Methods of Quantum Field Theory in Statistical Physics* (Dover, New York, 1963).
 - [21] W. Metzner, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 8549 (1991).
 - [22] E. Müller-Hartmann, Z. Phys. B **76**, 211 (1989).
 - [23] T. Kennedy, E. Lieb, and B. Shastri, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 2582 (1988).
 - [24] E. Manousakis, Rev. Mod. Phys. **63**, 1 (1991).
 - [25] Y. Kuramoto and N. Fukushima, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **67**, 583 (1998).